

REMARKS

This application was originally filed on 21 December 2000 with thirteen claims, two of which were written in independent form. Claims 10, 12, and 13 were amended on 5 March 2004. Claims 1-3, 7, 8, and 10 have been amended hereby in a non-limiting manner not for purposes of patentability, but rather to improve the consistency with which the terms of the claims are used. No claims have been allowed.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. No. 6,310,650 to Johnson et al. ("Johnson") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,485,279 to Yonemitsu et al. ("Yonemitsu"). The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 1 recites, "correcting said captured test image to remove DMD mirror tilt angle non-uniformities from said captured test image."

The Examiner stated, "Johnson does teach correcting a captured test image to remove DMD mirror tilt angle non-uniformities (note col. 5, lines 13-20 and 33-61). Johnson's system projector uses DMD device, Johnson col. 5 lines 55-61 describes the rotational state of DMD mirror, wherein the projection can create distortion. The examiner interprets this as DMD mirror tilt angle non-uniformities. As in the specification page 11 lines 15-24 of the instant application, the correction/removal of non-uniformities is performed in the filtering operation, Johnson transformation function corrects/removes non-uniformities (note col. 5 lines 18-20)."

The Examiner has failed to indicate any teaching in Johnson or Yonemitsu that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Johnson which teaches capturing an image that is "processed to identify any non-desirable characteristics, including visible artifacts such as seams, bands, rings, etc." and applying an "appropriate transformation function" to "pre-warp the input video signal that is provided to the display such that the non-desirable characteristics are reduced or eliminated from the display" to achieve the recited limitation of "correcting said captured test image to remove DMD mirror tilt angle non-uniformities from said captured test image."

The Examiner's rejection of Claim 1 as unpatentable over Johnson in view of Yonemitsu is unsupported by the prior art and should be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Johnson in view of Yonemitsu. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 1 and 7 recite, "A test method for measuring the low spatial uniformity of a DMD" comprising "extracting low frequency non-uniformity defect data from the result image." The Examiner stated, "Johnson is silent disclosing extracting low frequency non-uniformity defect data from the result image. However, Yonemitsu discloses extracting low frequency non-uniformity defect data from the result image (note col. 14 lines 35-40)." The applicant respectfully disagrees. The passage of Yonemitsu cited by the Examiner is describing a signal decoder, which cannot suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art to "extract low frequency non-uniformity defect data" from an image in order to test the "low spatial uniformity of a DMD." The Examiner's own provision of a suggestion to combine states, "Yonemitsu . . . extracts low frequency components alleviating noise and the degradation of image quality (note col. 12, lines 50-54). The applicant respectfully submits that improving the quality of an image signal does not suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art a method of "measuring the low spatial uniformity of a DMD" by "extracting low frequency non-uniformity defect data" from a processed captured image.

The Examiner's rejection of Claims 1 and 7 as unpatentable over Johnson in view of Yonemitsu is unsupported by the prior art and should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-6, 8, and 9 depend from Claims 1 and 7 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on their own merits.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Johnson in view of Yonemitsu. Claim 10 was also objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner stated Claim 10 would be deemed allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 11-13 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner stated Claims 11-13 would be deemed allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The applicant respectfully submits Claim 10 was amended to be in independent form by amendment filed on 5 March 2004. Claims 10-13 should therefore be deemed allowable in their current form.

In view of the amendments and the remarks presented herewith, it is believed that the

claims currently in the application accord with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are allowable over the prior art of record. Therefore, it is urged that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles A. Brill
Reg. No. 37,786

Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474 M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-4379
FAX: (972) 917-4418